



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

there appeared an anonymous little book, called *A Letter to Mr. Congreve on his Pretended Amendments, &c.* On page 20 of this exceedingly bitter attack upon the stage, we find the following:

"You quarrel at Mr. Collier's Phrase of *learning a Spaniel to Set*; which shews, that you are yet to *learn* the compass of our English Tongue, or that you are resolved to be a Wrangling, right or wrong. Say you, *I suppose, he means, teaching a Spaniel to Set.* But why so? What necessity is there for changing the Word, only to put as good a one in the place? For, is Mr. Congreve yet to be told, that *to learn*, is often used Actively, for *to teach*? Does he not remember it to be so used in the *Psalter*? *O learn me true Understanding!* I chuse to refer you to that Ejaculation, because it may be a proper one for you, to use in your Devotions."

The above controversy seems to me an interesting contribution to our knowledge of the history of the word "learn."

WM. LYON PHELPS.

Yale University.

GERMANIC GRAMMAR.

Laut- und Formenlehre der altgermanischen Dialekte. Zweites Buch. Herausgegeben von FERDINAND DIETER. Leipzig: O. R. Reisland, 1900.

THIS volume, which gives the *Formenlehre*, is a continuation of the *Lautlehre*, which appeared in 1898. The book is the combined work of R. Bethge (Urgerm., Goth., O.N.), F. Dieter (OE.), W. Schlüter (OS.), F. Hartmann (OHG.). In some points it necessarily covers the same ground as Streitberg's *Urgerm. Gram.*, but deals not so much with the relation of the Germ. dialects to other IE. languages as with their relation to each other. It is not intended to supplant the grammars of the various dialects, but to serve as "ergänzung zu den grammatischen einzeldarstellungen":

"Wird er [der studierende] zu jenen greifen, wenn er sich mit dem einen oder dem andern dialekt des näheren vertraut machen will, so mag dieses [lehrbuch] zur erweiterung seines blickes und vertiefung seines verständnisses beitragen, indem es ihm die altgermanischen dialekte als zweige vorführt, die demselben stamm entsprossen sind."

The object thus set is commendable, and the manner in which it is accomplished praise-worthy. For the matter is well arranged, the statements brief yet clear, and the whole admirably *übersichtlich*. Here and there, to be sure, explanations are given which, to say the least, are doubtful. But that is to be expected of any book, and does not detract from its general value and usefulness. In some places more space might well have been given for more thorough discussion of the matter.

I note the following points in which a different explanation, a change of statement, or an addition may or should be made:

§ 181, c. It is not altogether certain that Skt. *ṛṇōmi* 'errege,' Gk. *opvōm* are formed with a suffix *-neu-*. They are perhaps rather from a base *ereu-* with nasal infix, and related to Lat. *ruō*, Gk. *ῥοῶν* 'stürme los,' Skt. *ṛvā* 'runner,' etc. (cf. Hirt, *Idg. Abl.* 483). So also Lat. *struō*, Goth. *straujan*: Skt. *strñōti*, and others.—§ 183, b. Goth. *weiha* does not necessarily represent a pre-Germ. **wetko*, but may simply be a restoration of the normal type. This is certainly often the case in Goth. To ON. *vega* 'kämpfen, töten' add OE. *wegan* 'kill,' *ge-wegan* 'fight,' OHG. *wigant*, *ubar-wihit*, MHG. *wehen* 'kämpfen.' See also other examples of the restoration of the normal type, *Germ. Studies* II, 13 f. An example of this is probably Goth. *giman*, OHG. *queman*. In this case as in others the normal type may have originated in the inf., which was formed independently from the verb-stem. So certainly also Goth. *sitan* produced *sita*, whereas, in the other dialects, **sitjō* produced **sitjan* (cf. Streitberg, *Urgerm. Gram.* 286).—§ 186, c. Goth. *waldan* 'walten' is a very doubtful example for the suffix *-dho-* in view of the pret. ON. *olla*. On the other hand Goth. *haldan* is beyond question from a *-to-* suffix, as is plain from OHG. *halthan*, OSw. *halla*.

§ 196. 'Die sog. reduplizierten perfekta ohne reduplikation' are explained according to the old theory as coming from earlier reduplicated perfects. So ON., OE. *hēt* are supposed to be from Germ. **hēhait* on the assumption that intervocalic *h* fell out at an early period. But OE. *heht* shows rather that the stem vowel fell out first. Moreover **hēhait*

> **hehāt* > **he(h)at* could not give OE. *hēt* but rather **heot*. Compare OE. *bēot* 'promise; vow; boast' < **be(h)āt*; *þēon* < **þihan*, etc. Germ. **hēhait* > ON. *hēt* is equally improbable.

The objections raised against the explanation given by Brugmann, *IF*. VI, 89ff., and by myself, *Germ. Studies* II, 27 ff., are, as far as my explanation is concerned, based on a total misconception. To waste no time, let me briefly state my present view, which will not differ materially from that given by me in the article referred to.

I divide these verbs into five classes represented by Goth. (1) *skaidan*, (2) *stautan*, (3) *haldan*, (4) *lētan*, (5) *hwōpan*. The first three classes correspond to the first three series of ablauting verbs. The fourth class also has in it forms that properly belong to the first ablaut-series. The fifth class is composite, and in N. and W. Germ. follows one of the other classes.

In Goth. these verbs had a reduplicated perfect. In the other dialects there are a few remnants of the same formation. But instead of them we usually find a pret. without reduplication. This goes back to an imperfect or aorist. Thus we have for the ablaut of class (2) *au*; *eu* (*u*); *au*, in which *au* is from *au* or *ou*, and *eu* from *eu* or *eu*. So ON. *hlaupa*; *hljōp*, *hljōpum* (*hlupum*); *hlaupinn*.

All that was necessary to establish this type was the occurrence side by side of two formations; one with Germ. *au*, the other with *eu*. If the *eu*-formation was prominent, it naturally developed into a regular verb of the second ablaut-series. If, however, the *au*-formation was the stronger, then the pret. was either a reduplicated perf. or an imperfect of the normal type, that is, from *hlaupan* would be formed **hehlaup* or **hleup*.

The side by side occurrence of the *au*-(*ou* or *ou*) and *eu*-types is proved by the following: OE. *ā-hnēapan*, *-hnēop* 'pluck': Goth. *dis-hniupan*, *-hnaup* 'tear'; OE. **on-rēadan*, *on-rēod*; *rēodan*, ON. *rjōða*, Gk. *ἐρεῦθω* 'redden'; OE. **hēafan*, *hēof*; *hēofan*, Goth. *hiufan* 'lament', Skt. *cōpati* 'bewegt sich'; OE. *hēawan*, *hēow* 'hew, cut', ChSl. *kovati* 'hauen': Lat. *cūdō* 'strike, beat', Skt. *cōdati* 'treibt an' < **qēdeti*; ON. *būa*, *bjō* 'dwell': Skt. *bhāvati*

'arise, become.' In this way arose the ablaut *au*, *eu*, *au*, which is quite well preserved in N. and W. Germ.

Similarly from Germ. *haldan* came a reduplicated perf., as in Goth. *haihald*, and an imperfect **held*, which gave the pret. in the other dialects. The double formation *haldan*: **heldan* necessary to form this type is beyond question. So as follows:

ON. *halda*, *hell* < **helþ*, *helt*: Gk. *κέλωμαι*; OSw. *halpa*, ON. *hjalp* < **help*: OE. *helpan*; Gk. *πάλλω* 'shake', ON. *falla*, *fell* 'fall': Lat. *pellō*; OHG. *walzan*: ON. *velza*; OHG. *wal-lan*: ON. *vella*; OHG. *walkan*: Lith. *vėl-ti* 'walken'; OHG. *wallan*: Lith. *veldu*; OHG. *scaltan*: *sceltan*; OHG. *spaltan*: OE. *speld* 'splinter'; Goth. *imv. us-stagg*: OE. *stingan*; OSw. *varpa*: ON. *verða* 'werden'; ON. *ganga*, *gekk* < **ging*, *gingom*: Lith. *žengti* 'schreite', and perhaps also OHG. *gingen* 'wonach verlangen'; OS. *blandan*: Lith. *blendžius*, etc.

Here we have the ablaut *a*, *e* (*i*), *a*, which is retained in ON. In WG. this was modified by the other classes. In OHG. the five classes were reduced to two, —no. 5 being modeled after 2, and nos. 1, 3, 4 falling together.

As to the Germ. ablaut *ai*, *ē* (< *ēi*), *ai* in class 1, I consider that proved and not invented *ad hoc*, as any one must see who attentively reads the articles referred to above.

For class 4, Goth. *lētan*, it is certainly admissible to assume a Germ. ablaut *ā*, *ē*, *ā* if we allow the ablaut *ē(i)*: *ēi*. But even if this ablaut were not allowed, it can be shown that synonymous stems of the type *lēdo-* and *lēido-* occur. And where they are found in one language, it would be strange indeed if they did not supplement each other. For many examples see Hirt, *Idg. Ablaut*, 70ff.

In the fifth class also there is evidence for the ablaut *ō*: *ē* (< *ēi*) which is presupposed by ON. *blōta*; *blē(om)*, though the original ablaut has, in the other dialects, been obliterated through regular phonetic change and by analogy.

In evidence of the ablaut *ō*: *ēi* compare the following: OE. *spōwan* 'succeed', OHG. *spuot* 'success': ChSl. *spěja* 'succeed', Lith. *spėjū* 'musse, raum haben', Skt. *spāyate* 'wird

feist'; OE. *glōwan* 'glow,' *glōm* 'gloom': Lith. *žlejš* 'dämmerung,' *žlejšūti* 'dämmern'; OE. *blōwan* 'bloom,' OHG. *bluojan* 'blühen': *blājan* 'blähen, blasen.'

In these five classes, therefore, the pret. was formed with *en, e, ē*. In ON. these were kept distinct. In the other dialects they were somewhat confused. In what way I have explained in my article *The Redup. Verbs in Germ.*, to which I refer for a more extended discussion of this subject.

The establishment of verbal types is considered below in connection with the strong verbs.

§ 205. The discussion of participles is not altogether satisfactory. One might infer from it that the IE. mother-tongue had a fully developed verbal system, with a full set of participles, of which Germ. had inherited some and lost others. The fact of the case is, participles are simply specialized adjectives, and those suffixes which most frequently form verbal adjectives are naturally most often found as participle suffixes. That is, in this specialized use they became productive. It is, therefore, begging the question to say that Goth. *ðerusjōs* 'eltern' and *weitwōps* 'zeuge' are remnants of a perf. act. part. This, to be sure, is the usual explanation. But the fact that the suffixes in these words formed participles in other languages is no proof that they were ever productive enough in Germ. to form participles. We are also not warranted in saying that the medio-passive part. in *meno-* is 'erloschen' in Germ. With equal right we might say that the part. suf. *-ono-, -eno-*, so common in Germ., had died out in Gk., since it does not occur in the Gk. verbal system, though common enough in other functions. But the real explanation is that it did not gain a footing as a participle. It is, therefore, simply preposterous to think of the various suffixes forming participles in the different IE. languages as the direct inheritance of IE. part. suffixes. It is not at all probable that the author intended to convey any such meaning. But to prevent any one from making such an inference, a statement should begin the section calling attention to the common origin of verbal adjectives and participles.

§ 214. The strong verb receives the usual treatment. Here again the learner is apt to get wrong views. He will perhaps imagine that the wonderful regularity of the Germ. strong verb faithfully represents the IE. archetype. This, however, is far from being the case. The very regularity is *prima facie* evidence that we have in the six ablaut-classes (to omit the so-called reduplicating verbs) types which have spread far beyond their original boundaries. In other words, the multiformity of earlier times gave way to a few well-established types. In these types ablaut became a distinctive tense-mark, and therefore tended to remove other tense-signs. We speak, therefore, of ablauting verbs in Germ. in a sense in which we could not use that term in Gk., where a richly developed tense-system has made ablaut of less importance than in Germ.

Into these ablaut-classes, then, were crowded verbs which primarily had no ablaut, or at least not as it occurred in the verbal system. That is, these ablaut-classes became types according to which the verbs coinciding in one or more forms were conjugated. Hence a verb readily fell from one ablaut-series to another as soon as any change occurred which made it externally like the other. A notable example of this is the Germ. verb **pīhō* < **pīnhō* < pre-Germ. **tēnqō*. This in OE. has forms belonging to three ablaut-series: pret. plur. *þungon*, part. *þungen* (third series); pret. sing. *þāh*, plur. *þigon*, part. *þigen* (first series); pres. inf. *þēon*, pret. sing. *þeah*, plur. *þugon*, part. *þogen* (second series). Only those forms belonging to the third series are phonetically descended from the pre-Germ. forms. All the other forms are the result of the carrying out of types which this verb, through regular phonetic change, came to resemble. So the forms of the first ablaut-series followed the original OE. **pīhan*, as in Goth. *peihan*. But when this form regularly became *þion*, and thus fell in line with the second series, it brought in its train the other forms of that series.

In a work of this kind it would not be out of place to point out cases of 'entgleisung,' which is not always done. It would be possible, indeed, for a single verb stem to appear in

Germ. in five different ablaut-series. Thus a base *seŋeko-* might produce *seŋko-* > Germ. **seuhan* (second series); *syēko-* > Germ. **swēhan* (fifth series); *syōko-* (or *syokō-*) > Germ. **swahan* (or **swagan*) (sixth series); and, with nasal infix, *syēnko-* > Germ. **swihan* (first series); by the side of which might appear *syenbō-* > Germ. **swingan* (third series). Moreover, the same stem might have in Germ. the forms **swēhan*, **swōhan*, **swangan*, and, thus falling among the so-called reduplicating verbs, give three more types, to say nothing of the various weak verbs that might be derived from it.

§ 220. Goth. *bliggwan* should not be given under the third series. It is only graphically like *sigggwan*. It does not contain a nasal and is, therefore, unlike any verb of the third series.—§ 236. ON. *hrīna* 'schreien; berühren' should be entered as two distinct verbs: one connected with ON. *hreimr* 'geschrei,' *hrīka* 'knirschen,' Gk. *ῥπίζω*, etc. (cf. Persson, *Wz.* 194); the other with OE., OS. *hrīnan* 'touch,' Skt. *grīnāti* 'mengt, mischt, kocht,' *grāyati* 'kocht,' etc. (cf. Uhlenbeck, *Alt. Wb.* s. v.).—§ 287. OHG. **zwehhan*, from which *gizuochana* 'tristis,' is probably related to OE. *tūcian* 'ill-treat,' Lith. *daūziū* 'stosse.'—Anm. 2. Neither OHG. **klēnan* 'kleben' nor **lēchan* 'leck werden' belongs, "ihrer stambildung nach," to the fourth class. The former has gone over from the first series to the fifth, the *ē* representing an original *i*. Compare ON. *klīna* 'smear,' wk. verb, OE. *clām* 'mud, paste,' etc. In **lēchan* we have an inchoative to ON. *leka* 'leck sein.'

§ 303. Under the *īz-* suffix should be explained its further spread in WG., especially in *u-* stems and in the pres. part.—§ 305, 5. Goth. *-(u)assus* is not enough to explain OHG. *-nussi*, *-nissi*, *-nissa*, *-nassi*, etc. These can not all be reduced to *-at-tu* < *-ad-tu*, nor is it necessary to do so. Beside the suffix *-ad-* occur in Germ. *-ud-* and *-id-*, which combined with *-tu-* or *-ti-* or some other suffix with initial *-t-* would produce the forms that occur.—§ 310. ON. *prō*, OE. *prūh* 'kiste, sarg' can hardly be called root-nouns. I derive them from the root *tyer-*, Lith. *tvėti* 'fassen, zäunen,' etc., and compare with Gk. *ραπός* 'basket,' *ράπος* 'chest' < **tyrq̃o-*, Lith. *tvarka*

'haltung, ordnung, fassung,' OHG. *drūh* 'compes, pedica, fessel' < **tyr̥-q̃(i)*, MHG. *driuhēn* 'fangen, fesseln,' etc. (cf. *AJP.* xx, 265).—In general it may be said that the "Stambildung der Nomina" should be more fully treated. Strange to say, no mention is made of accent.

But to take no more space—the book will prove serviceable and meet with a welcome among all interested in Germanic philology.

FRANCIS A. WOOD.

Cornell College.

FRENCH LITERATURE.

La Tulipe Noire by ALEXANDRE DUMAS, edited by Prof. E. S. LEWIS. Henry Holt and Co., New York, 1900.

On opening *La Tulipe Noire*, edited by Prof. Lewis, teachers who have lately been reading his careful reviews in MOD. LANG. NOTES, expected a book which would establish a higher standard for future annotators. They must have been somewhat disappointed.

His grammatical notes are by far too numerous and would dishearten any student. It would be very interesting to know the number of scholars who look up those references on their own account and of teachers who oblige their pupils to do so.

His way of referring back to dictionaries for the translation of idioms is another discouraging feature. After the student has been repeatedly disappointed in his attempts to be enlightened by the notes, he considers it a waste of time to read them and directly opens his dictionary.

Besides, it will be seen by the following list that the proof was read with a certain amount of carelessness:

Page 5, line 18, *que* should be *qui*; p. 13, l. 13, *nu*, *un*; p. 15, l. 11, *veritable*, *véritable*; p. 25, l. 7, *dele* the dash; p. 32, l. 25, *au-delà*, *au delà* (cf. p. 91, l. 22, and p. 237, l. 17); p. 36, l. 2, *détente*, *détente*; p. 40, l. 27, *ban*, *van*; p. 65, l. 10, *cut*, *édit*; p. 79, l. 26, *dele* the comma after *et*; p. 79, l. 31, *le*, *la*; p. 81, l. 4, *qui*, *que*; p. 81, l. 15, *c'était*, *c'était*; p. 82, l. 20, supply a dash at the beginning of the line; p. 86, ll. 15 and 29, *résolument*, *résolument* (cf. Bevier, *Gr.* § 120,